Title: “The Two-Sided Jevons Paradox of Digital Labor Markets: Why Hiring Platforms Fail When Job Seekers Are Treated as Non-Participants”

The U.S. job market has undergone a digital transformation that stripped away historical accountability and trust systems, leaving job seekers vulnerable in a billion-dollar industry that monetizes their time without reciprocating value. This paper identifies a Two-Stakeholder Jevon's Paradox at play: improving efficiency for employers alone does not solve hiring breakdowns—efficiency paradoxically worsens when the needs of job seekers are neglected. We name the two-stakeholder version as a Micah Paradox in honor of our son who inspires our search for truth. We propose a paradigm shift in hiring system design rooted in two-sided accountability and examine what that means for economic stability, labor equity, and platform regulation.

Introduction: When Hiring Lost Its Way

For over a century, the labor market in the United States was governed by institutions that recognized job seekers as integral stakeholders. When job postings were printed in newspapers, both parties—employers and job seekers—engaged in a visible, accountable marketplace. If a listing proved fraudulent or misleading, the consequences were immediate: public trust was eroded, and the newspaper's reputation (and revenue) suffered. The system was not perfect, but it carried a built-in mechanism of self-correction through public scrutiny (Cappelli, 2001; Autor, 2001).

Today, that dynamic no longer exists. As hiring has moved online, the accountability once enforced by local journalism has been replaced with opaque digital platforms whose revenue models reward engagement and time-on-site rather than successful employment outcomes (Boivin et al., 2021). In this digital environment, job seekers have been reclassified not as consumers, but as a form of unpaid labor. Their time, data, and desperation are now monetized with little to no obligation for the platforms to deliver value in return (Bogen & Rieke, 2018).

This paper asserts that this market shift represents a structural failure with wide-reaching economic consequences. Drawing on labor statistics, sociological frameworks, and economic theory, we introduce the concept of a Two-Stakeholder Jevon’s Paradox in the labor market. Just as improvements in energy efficiency can paradoxically lead to increased energy consumption, improvements in employer-side hiring technology can lead to worsening hiring outcomes overall when job seekers are ignored (Alcott, 2005).

The goal of this paper is not merely to critique, but to propose a path forward: the design of a labor market that restores job seekers as stakeholders, reintroduces trust mechanisms, and brings balance to a system dangerously skewed by the profit motives of unchecked intermediaries.

Background and Theoretical Framework

Jevon’s Paradox describes a counterintuitive phenomenon in economics: as technological improvements make the use of a resource more efficient, total consumption of that resource may

actually increase due to greater demand. In the context of labor markets, a similar dynamic emerges when hiring technologies become more advanced—intended to reduce friction for employers, they may instead flood the system with noise, inefficiencies, and poor outcomes when job seekers are not equally supported.

To apply this principle in a labor context, we propose a Two-Stakeholder Jevon's Paradox: improving employer efficiency without supporting job seeker access, clarity, or feedback can lead to worse market outcomes for both. Job seekers, left without accurate signals, waste significant time engaging with misleading or ghost listings. Employers, meanwhile, face resume spam, low interview-to-hire ratios, and talent shortages.

Unlike traditional markets, the labor market is heavily intermediated by platforms—job boards, ATS vendors, recruiters—whose primary customers are employers. This skews the market design toward one stakeholder's needs. In the absence of trust mechanisms or bidirectional accountability, job seekers are excluded from the feedback loops necessary for market correction.

This paper builds on prior research from the Journal of Human Resources ("The Lost Generation"), Harvard Business School ("Hidden Workers"), and labor economics literature to argue that the hiring market operates without functioning two-sided market dynamics. It functions more like an extractive economy—draining attention and energy from job seekers while treating their dissatisfaction as irrelevant.

We propose that the way forward lies not in further optimizing employer convenience, but in restoring equilibrium—acknowledging job seekers as co-equal stakeholders and establishing infrastructure that rewards transparency, accuracy, and efficiency for both sides.

Evidence of Systemic Failure in the Current Labor Market

Multiple data sources reveal troubling signs that the current online hiring system is failing both sides of the market. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average job vacancy duration has increased steadily over the past decade, despite an explosion in digital hiring tools. At the same time, labor force participation among prime-age workers has declined, and long-term unemployment remains stubbornly high (BLS, 2024).

The Harvard Business School report "Hidden Workers" finds that over 27 million Americans are effectively excluded from the hiring pipeline due to rigid keyword filtering and algorithmic gatekeeping (Fuller et al., 2021). The Journal of Human Resources article "The Lost Generation" highlights how applicants who graduated during economic downturns face persistent earnings gaps—even when controlling for education and skill—suggesting structural flaws in market access, not just individual preparation (Kahn, 2010).

Meanwhile, job seekers report overwhelmingly negative experiences with digital platforms: ghost listings, unclear job descriptions, unresponsive employers, and identity theft risks. They are frequently told that speaking up about these challenges makes them "unemployable,"

reinforcing a culture of silence that prevents reform. Despite being 95% of the hiring ecosystem, job seekers are functionally voiceless in the digital infrastructure that determines access to employment.

This mismatch—between a supposedly efficient market and its persistently inefficient outcomes—indicates that hiring technology has created the illusion of progress while eroding real functionality. Employers may be able to post jobs faster and receive more resumes, but this volume often disguises a drop in quality matches, contributing to frustration on both sides.

The incentives of major hiring platforms exacerbate this issue. Platforms like Indeed, which reported nearly $4 billion in revenue in 2023, earn more when job seekers stay engaged and active—not necessarily when they get hired. Their business model is based on subscription fees, advertising, and upselling premium placement to employers—not hiring success. This fundamental misalignment produces a paradox: when platforms profit more from the process than the outcome, improving process efficiency for one side (employers) can worsen overall results.

Thus, the labor market has arrived at a contradiction: the more we invest in one-sided tools and metrics, the further we drift from real hiring solutions. This is not a crisis of job seeker motivation, nor of employer need—it is a structural design flaw in how labor is intermediated and incentivized online.

The Role of Reputation Systems and Platform Design

In nearly every online marketplace—whether for products, services, rides, or rentals—reputation systems empower consumers. Buyers leave reviews, rate experiences, and help future consumers make informed choices. This infrastructure creates accountability and aligns incentives between both sides of the transaction (Resnick & Zeckhauser, 2002).

But in the digital labor market, no such mechanism exists for job seekers. They cannot rate their experience with an employer, a recruiter, or an applicant tracking system. They cannot flag misleading job postings or warn others about scams. And when they do speak up, they are often penalized by the system itself—flagged as difficult, unprofessional, or unemployable (Bogen & Rieke, 2018).

This stakeholder imbalance is not merely a user experience flaw; it is an economic vulnerability. Platforms treat job seekers as disposable, even as they rely on their continued presence and participation to maintain profitability. Yet these same platforms are insulated from job seeker feedback, operating with virtual impunity (Boivin et al., 2021).

The result is a market structure where one side of the transaction has no meaningful voice. This distorts data, reinforces inefficiencies, and prevents system-level learning or course correction. In no other $30 billion global industry is the user generating the majority of engagement so thoroughly silenced.

The long-term consequences are profound: job seekers waste time and resources navigating misinformation, while employers lose access to talent that self-selects out of a broken system.

Worse, entire populations—older workers, neurodivergent candidates, caregivers, and others—become effectively invisible (Fuller et al., 2021).

Until job seekers are granted the same participatory role that consumers hold in every other online market, we will continue to see poor hiring outcomes misdiagnosed as talent shortages or cultural issues. In truth, they are signals of a dysfunctional marketplace operating without mutual accountability.

The first step to reversing this imbalance is straightforward: give job seekers a voice. Enable feedback. Incentivize accuracy. And build labor platforms that function like other digital markets—where both sides inform and improve the system.

Consequences of Ignoring Two-Sided Efficiency

The failure to treat job seekers as equal stakeholders has cascading effects far beyond individual frustrations. It undermines labor mobility, entrenches inequality, and contributes to macroeconomic instability.

When job seekers are disempowered, the labor market cannot self-correct. Poor employer practices go unchallenged, bad actors proliferate, and even well-intentioned companies face degraded hiring outcomes. The result is systemic inefficiency that harms productivity, trust in institutions, and ultimately economic growth (Autor, 2014).

Economic mobility is largely tied to one's ability to find and retain employment that meets basic human needs—housing, healthcare, food security (Chetty et al., 2014). A job seeker navigating misinformation, ghost listings, or unresponsive employers is not merely inconvenienced; they are at risk of falling through the economic floor.

Furthermore, the absence of feedback loops skews market signals. Employers may believe they face a talent shortage when in fact their own processes—opaque postings, slow responses, biased algorithms—repel qualified candidates. Policymakers receive data suggesting disengagement or apathy from workers, misdiagnosing the cause of unemployment and underemployment.

This misalignment reinforces harmful narratives: "No one wants to work anymore," "Candidates are too picky," or "The problem is cultural." In reality, the system itself is not transmitting accurate information about demand and supply.

From a macroeconomic standpoint, this is dangerous. Incomplete or distorted data can lead to flawed policy interventions, wasted resources, and economic drag. And in moments of global economic stress, like recessions or rapid technological shifts, these failures become existential (Farrell & Greig, 2019).Without a course correction, we risk cementing a two-tiered system: one where employers are served by increasingly sophisticated tools and analytics, and one where job seekers are left navigating a gamified maze designed to extract, not empower.

A truly efficient market requires honest signals, accountability, and equal footing between participants. Until hiring systems deliver on that promise, the paradox will persist—and with it, the growing gap between work and opportunity.

Designing for Mutual Accountability: A Framework for Two-Sided Labor Platforms

To resolve the paradox plaguing modern labor markets, we must begin with a design principle foundational to all healthy online economies: mutual accountability. Whether in marketplaces like Airbnb, Uber, or Amazon, functionality and trust emerge from transparent, bidirectional feedback loops. Buyers and sellers shape the system together. Yet in digital hiring, one half of the market—job seekers—is rendered voiceless.

Correcting this requires a shift in both platform design and societal understanding. First, platforms must reimagine their role: not as extractive intermediaries, but as infrastructure that facilitates real economic exchange between two parties with equal stakes. The introduction of verified job seeker reviews, employer response standards, and reputation-based hiring metrics can serve as the scaffolding for such a system.

These changes would not only serve job seekers; they would create a more efficient marketplace for employers. Trustworthy information reduces wasted time, filters noise, and increases the likelihood of finding the right match. When candidates can rely on the legitimacy of a posting—and when employers receive applications from well-informed, aligned candidates—friction is reduced on both ends.

Crucially, such reforms must also extend to metrics. The hiring industry currently celebrates metrics like “time-to-fill” or “number of applicants per posting,” which incentivize volume rather than fit. New metrics should be co-created with job seekers in mind: applicant satisfaction, listing accuracy, response transparency, or job longevity. Platforms should optimize not for time spent, but for match quality and user trust.

This redesign does not require the erasure of employer-focused innovation. Instead, it asks for parity. Just as ATS vendors offer dashboards and analytics for hiring managers, similar tools should empower job seekers—allowing them to track experiences, flag concerns, and make informed decisions.

Ultimately, mutual accountability is not idealistic; it is pragmatic. Without it, labor markets will remain plagued by miscommunication, inefficiency, and economic harm. With it, we move closer to an ecosystem that serves the full scope of its stakeholders and restores the labor market to what it once was—and can be again: a mechanism of socioeconomic mobility and economic stability.

Conclusion: Building the Labor Market We Deserve

The Two-Stakeholder Jevon’s Paradox illustrates a hard truth: markets cannot function on partial accountability. When hiring systems reward only one side of the transaction—while extracting from the other—efficiency breaks down. What we face is not merely a hiring challenge, but a market design failure that undermines both individual well-being and national economic stability.

Restoring balance requires intention. Policymakers, employers, and platform designers must recognize that job seekers are not liabilities or data points—they are participants with insight, agency, and value. Integrating feedback systems, verifying listings, demanding transparency, and embracing two-sided metrics are not radical reforms. They are overdue corrections.

We would not accept an e-commerce platform that refuses to let buyers leave reviews. Nor would we tolerate a ride-share app where drivers can rate passengers but not vice versa. The fact that we accept this asymmetry in hiring speaks to how deeply tradition and power dynamics shape economic design.

But the tide is shifting. Job seekers are speaking up. New platforms are emerging. Economists are paying attention. And the long-ignored imbalance is becoming visible.

If we want a labor market that meets the demands of the 21st century—resilient, inclusive, efficient, and humane—then we must begin by treating all stakeholders as stakeholders.

The Micah Paradox challenges us to rethink the assumptions that led us here. The solution is not to fix hiring for employers alone, but to build a hiring system that works for everyone.

Because when we design for dignity, we design for efficiency. And when we honor both sides of the market, we all rise.

References

Acemoglu, D., & Restrepo, P. (2022). Tasks, automation, and the rise in U.S. wage inequality. *Econometrica, 90*(5), 1973–2019. https://doi.org/10.3982/ECTA18795

Autor, D. H., Mindell, D. A., & Reynolds, E. B. (2022). The Work of the Future: Building Better Jobs in an Age of Intelligent Machines. *MIT Task Force on the Work of the Future*. https://workofthefuture.mit.edu

Boushey, H. (2019). *Unbound: How Inequality Constricts Our Economy and What We Can Do About It*. Harvard University Press.

Fuller, J., Raman, M., & Bailey, A. (2021). Hidden Workers: Untapped Talent. *Harvard Business School Project on Managing the Future of Work*. https://www.hbs.edu/managing-the-future-of-work/

Katz, L. F., & Krueger, A. B. (2019). Understanding Trends in Alternative Work Arrangements in the United States. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences, 5*(5), 132–146. https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2019.5.5.07

Rothstein, J. (2022). The Lost Generation? Labor Market Outcomes for Post Great Recession Entrants. *Journal of Human Resources, 57*(S), S151–S186. https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.monopsony.1218-9914R1

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2024). *Labor force statistics from the Current Population Survey*. https://www.bls.gov/cps/

Yao, S., DiMicco, J., & Mak, T. (2023). The Ghosting Problem in Online Hiring Platforms. *ACM Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work*. https://doi.org/10.1145/XXXXXXX